DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 209 HE 003 531

AUTHOR	Trotter, Bernard; And Others
TITLE	"The Ten O'Clock Scholar?" What A Professor Does for His Pay.
INSTITUTION	Council of Ontario Universities, Toronto.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Higher Education; Noninstructional Responsibility; *Professors; Teacher Welfare; *Teaching Load; *Working Hours

ABSTRACT

Many people protest that professors are overpaid for the amount of time that they spend in the actual classroom situation. However, what most people do not realize is that classroom time is not the only time that the professor must devote to his work activities. The typical package of professorial duties would necessarily include: (1) scheduled classes such as lectures, seminars, labs, and tutorials; (2) unscheduled tutorials, review sessions, etc.; (3) individual counselling related to specific courses; (4) graduate student thesis supervision; (5) research; (6) other study and scholarly work; (7) administration in one's own university, including services to students not related to specific courses, departmental administration, faculty administration, and university administration; (8) inter-university administration; and (9) service to the discipline (professional societies, etc.). These combined duties generally add up to 50 work-hours per week for the 9-month period between September and May, which averages out to a 12-month work-week of appreciably more than 40 hours. (HS)

ED 069209

"THE TEN O'CLOCK SCHOLAR?"
What A Professor Does For His Pay

Bernard Trotter
David L. McQueen
Bertrand L. Hansen

Committee on Research and Planning
Council of Ontario Universities

May 1972

72-8

HE 003 531

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 069209

"THE TEN O'CLOCK SCHOLAR?"

What A Professor Does For His Pay

Bernard Trotter
David L. McQueen
Bertrand L. Hansen

Committee on Research and Planning
Council of Ontario Universities

May 1972

72-8

"THE TEN O'CLOCK SCHOLAR?"

What a professor does for his pay

It is perhaps natural that much of the public concern about the large expenditures of public money required for universities should focus on the activities of faculty. Faculty salaries and fringe benefits are the largest single component of university expenditures. It is frequently suggested, therefore, that if faculty were more "productive", if each did more "teaching", fewer would be required and the costs of universities would be reduced. In the public mind, seven or nine or twelve hours a week in a classroom represents a "soft touch" and identifies university professors as a privileged, underworked class.

Public misunderstanding about what the university professor does for his salary falls into two main parts. The first is an impression that the average university teacher doesn't work very hard during the academic year from September to May and then does nothing at all for a long spring and summer holiday. The second is the belief that in his "spare time" the professor does research which in most cases is of little direct benefit either to his students or to society at large.

Going on from these assumptions, the uninformed critic of the university concludes that if professors worked harder and spent a greater proportion of their total time on teaching and less on research, "productivity" per professor would rise and costs would fall.

This summary view of university faculty activities (which does not appear to be in any way a caricature when set against some recent newspaper editorials) indeed represents a serious misunderstanding. The misunderstanding is natural enough, reflecting as it does the fact that some parts of the complex of inter-related activities that go on at a university are far less visible to the public than others. But distorted views of this kind must not be allowed to exert a significant influence on government policies towards universities in Ontario, because the long-run results are likely to be damaging to universities and Canada generally, and disappointing to government and the public. It is particularly important to offer corrective evidence since the draft report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education appears to reinforce a number of popular misconceptions about what faculty do and about the integrated nature of their activities.

The basic argument developed here falls into four parts as follows:

(1) The professor who is doing his job properly addresses himself to a "set" of interrelated duties, of which periodic presentations in classrooms, seminar rooms and laboratories are only a few. Significant amounts of time and effort must also be devoted to research, study, administration and other activities.[1/]

(2) The best available statistical studies suggest that, on average through the year, the typical professor, like other professionals in occupations where the individual has substantial autonomy, works appreciably longer hours than most members of the labour force.

(3) It follows from this that if the professor is required to increase sharply the allocation of hours to classroom performances, he will, in most cases, have to cut back on something else. Because of the interrelated nature of his activities, this cutting back elsewhere may significantly reduce the quality of his classroom presentations.

(4) The probability that increased classroom hours would result not so much in a longer work-week but in fewer hours being devoted to research and study is particularly to be feared. Professorial research and study are, among other things, an essential preparation and foundation for satisfactory learning experiences in the classroom. They also generate other longer-range benefits for society.

1/ It is increasingly the practice to subdivide the research function into "Research I", involving the discovery of new knowledge and new applications of knowledge, and "Research II", involving "keeping up in the discipline", assimilating new knowledge and relating it to existing knowledge. These terms originated in the Corry-Bonneau Commission Study for the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Research I embraces both basic research and "mission-oriented" or applied research. Both kinds of research are essential to teaching, Research II very obviously so, and Research I more indirectly (though no less significantly), spreading its influence through the various interconnections between the university's role as teacher and its role as learner - as a generator of new knowledge for society. Not every professor is or should be heavily engaged in Research I, but if he is not, then he should be in touch with others who are, and in this and other ways keep up the necessary Research II backing for his teaching. Analysis of the research function provides the most significant illustration of the fact that professorial functions are an interrelated set of elements, and that while there is usually room for marginal adjustment, if any important element is missing or weak, the whole will be seriously deficient.

Functions of the professor

Why is the package of professorial functions so complex? Why is there such a notably high ratio of hours spent outside the classroom to those spent within it? Much of the answer to these questions relates to the nature of university teaching and to the type of learning experience that the student comes to the university to obtain.

Over the last several generations, there has of course, occurred, at all levels of education, a movement away from rote-learning - from the dreary instillation of facts and their subsequent regurgitation on examination papers. There is increasing emphasis on active participation and involvement of students in the learning process, and on learning how to think and learn rather than what.

Because of the greater age and maturity of university students, university learning has always been comparatively free and participatory, although contemporary thinking about these matters has pushed the universities even further in this direction.

Relatively free and participatory learning, when it works well, is undoubtedly more satisfying to all involved, and also more effective. But making it work well demands a great deal more of both students and teachers. Especially does it demand preparation and follow-up on both sides. If there is to be fruitful dialogue and interchange in the classroom and seminar room, it must be informed dialogue and interchange. This means hours of study in libraries and elsewhere, and in ancillary training activities such as the writing of essays by students and their evaluation by faculty.

A good example is furnished by a typical second-year course in the principles of economics. A fair proportion of the classroom hours devoted to such a course may be in a relatively conventional lecture format, with the instructor's presentation interrupted only periodically by questions. The time taken by any individual professor in preparing a lecture will vary greatly depending on how many times he has given the course before, the academic background of the students, the size of the class, the difficulty of the material to be presented, and so on. As a very rough rule of thumb, there is a widespread notion that both students and professor in a principles course ought to spend a minimum of two hours of specific reading, study and preparation outside the classroom for every "contact" hour that they spend inside. From the professor's standpoint, however, this rule covers only immediately relevant preparation. It does not cover longer-range study and "back-up" - for example, keeping reasonably up-to-date, as a lecturer in a broad introductory course should, with at least the general nature of some of the rapid and often controversy-ridden developments that are currently occurring in several major branches of economics.[2/]

[2/] The two-hour rule also does not cover such things as the reading and evaluation of student essays, the setting and marking of examinations and problem sets, and special review sessions and counselling of individual students.

It must again be stressed that the appropriate ratio of preparatory time to contact time varies widely according to circumstances. The proportion of preparatory time can be considerably less when a course is a basic undergraduate one in a comparatively slow-changing field and has been given many times before and/or is being repeated for successive seminar groups. But for new courses, graduate courses and graduate thesis supervision, the amount of preparatory time per contact hour may have to be several times greater.

The fundamental point - that professors must prepare and that skimped preparation rarely goes unnoticed - will perhaps be seized readily enough by anyone outside a university who has had to make a public speech or participate in a panel discussion before an informed and critical audience. Prudent persons normally devote ample time to preparing for such occasions if they hope to emerge from them with their self-respect and reputation reasonably intact. Professors do the same thing, preparing during the regular term for several such appearances every week. Each constitutes a deadline.

With this as background, the following list sets forth the principal items in the typical package of professorial duties: (1) scheduled classes such as lectures, seminars, labs, tutorials (usually recorded specifically in university calendars), (2) unscheduled tutorials, review sessions, etc., (3) individual counselling related to specific courses, (4) graduate student thesis supervision, (5) research, (6) other study and scholarly work,[3/] (7) administration in one's own university, including services to students not related to specific courses, departmental administration, faculty administration, university administration, (8) inter-university administration, and (9) service to the discipline (professional societies, etc.).

It should be noted that only normal duties are included here - the duties for which the faculty member receives his university salary. The list does not include various forms of outside public service, sometimes paid and sometimes not; nor, of course, does it include private consulting - a matter to be taken up in the next section.

The close interrelation between the student-contact items in the list (items 1 through 4) and the research and study items (5 and 6) has already been touched upon and will be further developed in a later section.

[3/] Item 5 includes both Research I and Research II. Item 6 would be wholly Research II. This separation is a recent concept and was not included in previous study designs which yielded the composite distribution shown in the table on page 7.

Meanwhile, a word of explanation is in order concerning the administrative items (7, 8 and 9). Why do professors have to spend a substantial portion of their time on various kinds of administration? In a way, the answer can be traced back through history to the origins of universities as self-governing communities of scholars, teaching and learning together. But the persistence of a high degree of university self-government in the present age can better be explained as an inevitable consequence of one of the basic objectives of a true university - free enquiry - and of the complexity and specialization of fields of teaching and learning. Both these factors mean that only to a limited degree can universities be run by full-time administrators. Those who are actively engaged in the teaching and learning process, and who know directly whereof they speak, must be significantly involved in running the institution.

Some brief illustrations may indicate why such participatory administration is more of a genuine necessity in universities than in most other places. To be sure, some of the committee discussions in which professors participate are very ordinary nuts-and-bolts affairs, relating to parking and other such humble supporting services. But when it comes to committees dealing with library ordering policies, the setting and maintenance of academic standards, the approval of new courses and the devising and administering of rules for tenure, promotion, and merit-pay, the issues involved are central to the successful academic functioning of the university and can only be properly debated with the participation of people who are themselves active teachers and researchers, and who therefore have some real basis for being able to tell the difference between quality and humbug in their respective fields. For much the same reasons, provincial and Canada-wide professional and disciplinary associations must call on practicing academics to do a good deal of their administration.

The need for highly participatory forms of governance in universities has been accepted by the universities and encouraged by government and public opinion. It is all the more surprising therefore that the draft report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education ignores faculty effort in administration and service to the discipline in the analysis of expenditures in Appendix E.

Statistical studies of faculty workload

There have been a number of statistical studies of academic workload. All have had to cope with the characteristic problems of obtaining reasonably true measurements of the labour hours put in by people such as professors, lawyers, architects, industrial researchers and senior managers and technocrats in government and business - people who work mostly with their brains, who are not usually required to clock in and

---

4/ Draft Report, Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario (Queen's Printer, Toronto, 1972); available, free, from the Ontario Government Bookstore, 880 Bay Street, Toronto 5, Ontario.

out on a strict nine-to-five basis, and who are given considerable freedom, conjoined with an implied ethic of individual responsibility and self-discipline, because it is under these conditions that their energies are thought to flow most productively.

How do we measure the workloads of such people? By time spent at the "office"? But there are incontestable cases where some of the best work is done at home, in the privacy of the study or den. And what is, and what is not, "work"? When is the individual reading and thinking to some purpose, and when just relaxing or day-dreaming? Which of his activities are relevant to his job, and which not? If he is a member of various committees and other such bodies, which of these are in some sense part of his work, and which merely the sort of thing that any good citizen, in any line of work, might do in his spare time?

Of a number of recent studies that have tried to cope with these and other measurement problems as they come up in the particular case of professors, two of the most careful and thorough are those which have been conducted at the Universities of Toronto and California.[5/] It is of some interest and possible significance that their main statistical findings are similar enough that one can legitimately summarize them together. In very broad terms, the picture that emerges is this:

(1) During the busy season, from mid-September to early May, the great majority of professorial workloads falls above 50 hours a week.

(2) In the balance of the year, average work-hours are lower.

(3) Taking the two seasons together, the 12-month average work-week appears to be appreciably greater than 40 hours.

(4) Standard statistical measures of variation in these results are quite high, indicating a good deal of variability from individual to individual both in total hours worked and in seasonal pattern.

There is also a fair degree of agreement between the Toronto and California studies regarding the functional classification of faculty workloads. A composite picture of how professors allocate their working time during the September-May period would be as follows:

5/ See Report on a Study of Faculty Activities at the University of Toronto, Office of Institutional Research, University of Toronto, 1967 and Faculty Effort and Output Study, Office of Institutional Research, University of California, Berekely, undated. The Toronto study was conducted in 1966-67, the California study in 1968-69.

Function	% of Time	
Scheduled classes (including direct preparation)	26	
Unscheduled tutorials, review sessions	4	
Thesis supervision	8	
Student counselling	2	
Subtotal (teaching, advising and counselling)		40
Research	23	
Scholarly activities and other study	10	
Subtotal (research and study)		33
University administration	18	
Inter-university administration	4	
Subtotal (administration)		22
Professional activities		5
		100

An important feature of this breakdown is its demonstration of the fallacy involved in simply looking at a university calendar and deducing academic workload from it. The calendar may show only six scheduled hours for a professor but his unscheduled instruction, thesis supervision, and counselling may add another 8 hours to raise weekly student contact time to 14 hours. Preparation time for the six hours of scheduled classes comes on top of this, perhaps bringing total hours a week for teaching, direct preparation, advising and counselling to somewhere in a range of 20 to 30 hours.

During the September-May season, the average functional distribution shows about 40% of total work-hours devoted to instruction of students, 33% to research and scholarly activities, 22% to administration, and 5% to professional associations and other such activities. Again, it must be noted that the distribution around this average is high, reflecting individual and disciplinary differences. For example, a professor with a deep dislike and pronounced lack of talent for administration may, with the full blessing of his colleagues, decide to concentrate his activities in other fields.

There is also much variation in the pattern of summer activities. Some professors, notably those whose September-May schedule is heavily weighted with graduate student supervision and major on-going research projects, may continue a very similar pattern through most of the summer. More commonly, however, teaching hours drop off sharply in the summer and there is a greater relative concentration on scholarly research, new-course preparation and general study. It must also be said that some professors do virtually nothing of importance during this period, and that not all who "drop out" in this fashion have earned so prolonged a

rest. Like other sectors of society, the universities have their laggards. They also have their large-scale producers. Overall, the studies show that the average work-week (well over 40 hours year-round) of the average academic would compare favourably with that of self-employed professionals and managers in industry.

Putting summer and winter together, the average year-round distribution of functions works out to approximately 40% of total time to teaching, 40% to research and scholarly activities, 15% to administration and 5% to professional and other activities.

The above functions do not include paid and unpaid public service and counselling outside the universities. Professors in certain disciplines are in demand as consultants and advisors to business and government. Like members of other professions they may receive fees for such services. The great majority of professors will receive very small additions to income, if any, for non-university counselling services; a few are able to supplement their university incomes substantially. Analysis of the best available data in North America indicates that the average is probably less than $1000 per person.6/

Allocation of workload and evaluation of performance

Teaching responsibilities in a university are usually organized at a departmental level. This is a matter of practical necessity because the mix of activities involved varies widely from one subject to another. In many cases a "normal course load" will be defined as a basis for a fair distribution of responsibility. (In one common example, a course requires two lecture hours plus one tutorial hour each week or the equivalent in laboratory hours.) For example, a department may be staffed so that all of its courses can be offered if each member gives two courses for the whole academic year and an additional course for one term. In this case the normal course load is two and a half courses. But some members of the department may give three courses while others will give only two, or one and a half because they are engaged in important research. As well, other members may be given below-average undergraduate teaching loads because they carry heavier responsibilities for graduate students, or are teaching larger classes without assistance, or have heavy administrative or committee responsibilities. Correspondingly, members of the department without many of these other responsibilities may properly be asked to carry heavier-than-average undergraduate teaching loads. No two university

---

6/ The NSF Summary of American Science Manpower, 1968, published in January 1970 shows a difference of $2,500 between academic year and calendar year income of scientists in educational institutions. This summary includes medical doctors but does not include humanities professors who make up about 25% of total staff. In Canada the Manpower and Immigration Branch report Canada's Highly Qualified Manpower Resources by Atkinson, et.al., 1970, shows a difference of about $600 although the sample reporting secondary employment is very small and likely reflects a downward bias. The secondary employment income of humanities professors (not included in the survey) would be very small, hence we estimate that total average secondary income excluding medical doctors would probably be less than $1000 and certainly less than $1500 annually.

professors will or should have precisely the same workloads and that is why it is appropriate to leave the assignment of specific responsibilities to departments. A fairer distribution is more likely to result from this procedure where members of the department themselves are involved in the decisions than from the application of a rigid overall university norm. Of course, if a whole faculty can agree on a single standard applicable to many departments, this simplifies administration. Frequently, however, the attempt to apply rigorous standards will distort the activities of departments whose ways of doing things are and should be different.

A survey of Arts and Science faculties at Ontario universities conducted this year showed the following with respect to policies for assigning, reporting and evaluating the workloads of professors. Most universities require faculty to report annually (frequently on prepared forms) more or less under the following headings: regular courses taught, course enrolments, summer and extension courses taught, graduate supervision, committee activities, research and other development work, publications, lectures and papers delivered outside the university and participation in meetings of learned societies. These reports contribute to the assessment of faculty for annual salary increments or promotion. Some universities are beginning to develop numerical rating devices which apply weights to the different activities or which assign numerical ratings to student/staff ratios and class sizes for both assignment of workload and assessment of departmental activities. A few universities use explicit norms for assigning workload such as three courses or nine hours; others leave this to departmental decision. Most universities put some limits on summer or extension activities for which additional payments are made. At the same time it must be emphasized that, until the present time such services could not have been provided without faculty willing to "moonlight". Similarly, most universities will have limits on consulting with the control often exercised at the departmental level.7/

While it is true that in many ways university professors enjoy a great deal of freedom in scheduling important parts of their work, many of their activities are rigidly scheduled. Increasingly teaching effectiveness is playing a larger role in advancement. Teaching, however, involves the many ways in which faculty members interact with students and assist them in the process of learning. Some persons are brilliant scholars, first-rate small group teachers, and excellent supervisors of advanced students working on their own research. Others may excel in the larger lecture hall. A few will be equally effective in every situation.

While teaching effectiveness involving student opinion is increasingly important in advancement, peer judgement of scholarly competence continues to play a major, even a decisive role. Competence in a field of study is nowadays too specialized a matter to be determined by other means. The peer group judgement usually involved in weighing all of the strengths and weakness of colleagues is by no means a perfect mechanism. It is

---

7/ This is a brief summary of a survey conducted by Trevor Tolley, Dean of Arts, Division I, Carleton University for the Ontario Council of Deans of Arts and Science.

possible for settled opinion and experience within a discipline to reject the validity of new approaches to scholarship in a discipline. There are sometimes vigorous and rancorous controversies among scholars of different persuasions within a single subject. The quarrels of termagant priests are, of course, by no means, a modern phenomenon. Most modern scholars are, however, less sure that they alone have discovered the key to truth in a discipline and in any case place more value on the intellectual ability of the person they are judging than on the degree to which his professional opinions coincide with theirs. The occasional instances where personality conflicts and doctrinal differences combine to produce a storm are part of the price to be paid for a vital and open academic community.

Scholarship and university teaching

"Scholarly work" perhaps requires some amplification. No university teacher can maintain a reputation for competence by coasting on the work he or she did in graduate school. It is a commonplace nowadays to talk of the "knowledge explosion". This is not a figment of the academic imagination. It does not matter whether the store of human knowledge is doubling every decade or tripling. The proliferation of knowledge and the specialization which contributes to it face the contemporary scholar with massive problems of selection and assimilation. This phenomenon applies as much to the humane disciplines as to the sciences and social sciences. There may be dead languages but there are no dead disciplines and new ones are constantly in the process of flowering. Modern linguistics is a case in point drawing as it does on mathematics, anthropology, psychology and philosophy in the study of language.

One indicator of the knowledge explosion with which the university teacher must cope is the volume of scholarly literature which he is required to sift. Precise figures are hard to come by. The Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada (3rd edition 1966) contains more than 150,000 titles which began publication before 1950. The Library of Congress New Serial Titles in 1969 listed 230,000 titles which began publication in 1950 or later. The volume of information varies greatly from title to title. Some are issued infrequently while others are monthly, weekly, or daily publications. But the number of titles indicates the growth in this area of publication where new information is first made available to scholars. No library can hope to maintain complete files of more than a fraction of the available serial and periodical output. Nevertheless the expenditure on periodicals and serials at a typical older university in Ontario increased more than eleven times between 1960 and 1970. More specifically, the master list of journals and serials from which the Modern Language Association of America's International Bibliography is derived has grown from about 1,000 in 1961 to nearly 2,500 in 1970. This bibliography listed 13,000 entries in 1960 and includes 40,000 in 1970. Figures could be compiled showing similarly rapid growth in publications of other disciplines.

Why should the university teacher attempt to "keep up" with such an overwhelming volume of information? The answer lies in the nature of the university and its role in the generation of new knowledge. The university offers students the opportunity to learn from persons who are themselves working on the frontiers of knowledge. There can be other kinds of learning opportunities for students, but it is this contact with the leading edge of research work which provides the uniqueness of the university. Some university teachers are more interested in original "front-line" research than others. But no teacher belongs in a university if he is not an active scholar working creatively in his discipline in the way described earlier as Research II. Creative work in the Research I sense, in some disciplines, involves studying the work of others and forming new critical perspectives on it. The "frontiers of knowledge" have very different topographies in the various disciplines.

There is indeed argument about how much continuing "scholarly work" is required for university teaching. Even if such work could be measured with any accuracy we would expect individuals to vary considerably in the relative effort which they direct to such work. But the requirement for scholarly work, substantially in excess of any theoretical level required for teaching, rests on a further responsibility of the university which it, and it alone performs for society. Universities do much original research and create new knowledge for society. They have no monopoly on this function; nor have universities a monopoly on the function of criticism in society. But, original research and criticism and reappraisal of society's needs and objectives depend in a fundamental way on the continuing assimilation and synthesis of new knowledge which is uniquely a function of university scholarship. This monopoly depends not only on the information storage capacity of universities; it depends also on the unique combination of a critical mass of scholars with easy access to information. In the midst of the knowledge explosion, the institutionalization of scholarship in order to assimilate the proliferating production of new knowledge and bring it to bear on the existing structure of things is more vital than ever before. Scholars could not perform this service in isolation from each other. The paradox of the knowledge explosion is that while, on the one hand, sub-fields become more and more highly specialized within disciplines, each discipline becomes increasingly dependent on work done in neighbouring disciplines.

The need to reconsider things as they are in relation to new knowledge is an important aspect of the scholarly work which we have been attempting to describe. Sometimes the synthesis involved in merging the existing with the new is a gradual, imperceptible process. In other cases it produces dramatic and visible change in the world beyond the university. A striking example of the latter is the curriculum in mathematics first

introduced in Ontario schools a little more than ten years ago. The assimilation of the concepts involved had begun in universities a generation earlier and their synthesis emerged gradually during the intervening years. When accepted by the educational system for implementation it appeared as a dramatic change because it made even primary school mathematics a foreign language for parents whose own schooling had been based on old concepts. This example could be multiplied dozens of times in other subject areas. Much of what is taught in the primary and secondary schools, in the agricultural colleges, in the colleges of applied arts and technology is derived in the first instance from synthesis achieved through university scholarship. The university is not then just a producer of new knowledge; it performs the equally important function of assessing and evaluating new knowledge in terms of its implications for things as they are. Scholarship, in this sense, is the source of continuous renewal without which a society dies just as education allied with scholarship helps to produce the new leadership on which a living society is equally dependent.

How much time does "scholarship" take? How much is enough? Scholarship is necessary to teaching at the university level and most scholars agree that the stimulus of teaching and interaction with students nourishes scholarship and research. It would be just as fair to turn the question around and ask how much teaching is consistent with good scholarship? There is no ideal and no absolute answer can be given. There will be great differences in pattern of activity from one individual to another. Some professors who deal mainly with advanced students in a research laboratory can perhaps keep up with their reading throughout the year. Some of their colleagues who carry heavy programmes of lecturing, graduate supervision, and essential administrative tasks during the fall and winter can only catch up on scholarly work in the spring and summer. The draft report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education has totally ignored these considerations in the over-simplified model of Appendix E and in its proposal to fund research separately from teaching.

Conclusions

It is clear on scholarly grounds alone that formal course loads should on average be somewhat lighter (as they are) than they were twenty years ago. But while knowledge was exploding universities were changing as well in ways which now demand more faculty energy and time than in former years. As we have already noted, faculty together with students now have a primary role in shaping major policy decision in universities. This increased "participation", generally welcomed and supported by the public, involves a great deal of effort by members of faculty in addition to their scholarly and teaching duties. Furthermore, faculty are now expected much more than formerly to assist in the general counselling of students. This is quite necessary as student numbers have increased and as more of them arrive at university without clear notions of what they want to do after leaving university.

In all of these ways then, the job of being a university teacher has become, if anything, more demanding in recent years. Earlier we suggested that, while there are no doubt lazy people in universities as elsewhere, the pressures on university teachers are such that the minimum level of performance required is relatively high. As university expansion slows, and as larger numbers of qualified staff present themselves, rates of promotion will slow down. The pressures for better teaching performance can be expected to increase. But there can be no effective substitute for peer group judgement at the departmental level in deciding how the teaching responsibilities of the department are to be discharged and how each member of the department is to be evaluated.

The normal internal pressures on each faculty member to pull his weight has recently been intensified through introduction of discipline appraisal involving external assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of individual departments by outside experts. This system was introduced in the first instance to maintain adequate standards in new graduate programmes being introduced in a period of rapid expansion in advanced work in Ontario universities. Within the last year, however, this method is being applied to all graduate programmes in selected disciplines in all universities. It remains based essentially on peer group judgements, but widens the circle of peers immediately concerned to include experts from other universities in Ontario, elsewhere in Canada, and other countries.

The attempt here has been to show the futility of attempting to establish detailed and rigid "norms" for the workloads of individual faculty members. In their own interests universities will use their resources, including faculty, as well as they know how. There are no absolutes in deciding what level of support for universities is "necessary". As the official document establishing the present method of formula financing in Ontario pointed out, "universities are spending institutions and there is no upper limit, within reason, to what they can usefully spend on improved teaching, more extensive research and the facilities which these things involve".

It follows from this that the government should listen to what universities tell them the results will be if real resources continue to be cut. Once the government decides on the amount it can afford to spend on universities and on the method of allocation, the universities should themselves solve their own problems of internal allocation and deployment of teaching effort. It may be unrealistic to expect wide public understanding of the complexity and tremendously varied kinds of activity in which the professor is involved. But it is clear that whether such understanding is achieved or not, universities must be themselves responsible

for achieving a mix of scholarly activity, teaching and research appropriate to their objectives. If this responsibility is diminished they, by definition, cease to be universities.

A project of the COU Committee on Research and Planning prepared by:

Bernard Trotter,
Head,
Office of Academic Planning,
Queen's University.

David L. McQueen,
Chairman,
Department of Economics,
Glendon College,
York University.

Bertrand L. Hansen,
Director of Research, Council of Ontario Universities
and Associate Professor of Higher Education,
University of Toronto.

April 24, 1972.